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10. *Justice is best determined in a court of law.*

There likely shall never truly be such a thing as a system proof of error, for this constant fall into error and disorder is simply an unavoidable law of life, entropy. All objects, according to this law, in an isolated system tend to disorder. What better an isolated system to relate to than that of the court of justice? No exterior opinions or biases are permitted to infiltrate and result in a compromise to the integrity of this system, yet it simply cannot help but be prone to error. If this system was to hold in its sole grasp the fate of a human being, it is highly uncertain what this poor person may be submitted to, all for the risk of an attainment of a false jurisdiction. Let us say that this man was a murderer and had a skilled enough lawyer to be proven innocent, would society simply be forced to accept the danger of having this criminal roaming freely amongst them? If society were to be prohibited from making judgments of their own, then this would evidently be the case, but if it could effectively convict this man of murder and take justice into their own hands by isolating him from society or inflicting some other agreed upon form of punishment it would likely serve to truly assure the future well being of our society. This system could very well fall to error as well, and may even have disastrous results similar to that of the Salem Witch Trials if left to its sole authority. Although, all of this could simply be avoided by creating a sort of blend of various forms of authority that could prove to serve as one of the most effective systems of justice ever devised. If the desired result is not attained in a conventional court of law, despite various appellations, public opinion may be drawn, and then evidence reevaluated through the eyes of those most affected. This serves as a balance between the eyes of strangers to the personal repercussions of the case seen in the court of law and the familiar eyes seen in this system. As our judge presents both conclusions and the support behind these conclusions, the two audiences may then reevaluate their thoughts and then come to their ultimate decision. Despite what you may believe, this system is yet far from ideal, there is always a possibility for improvement. Justice is, ideally, not best determined in a court of law nor likely anywhere, due to the uncertainty of a valid outcome resulting, but where fact is presented for the sake of truly proving the actions of the accused and the minds of many of differing backgrounds (not solely a bunch of impersonal people attending a case on jury duty, but those most directly affected by it and most immediately dependent upon its outcome). Remember, nothing is ever free of fault, rendering us humans incapable of determining true justice; as a result of this, we must determine the most effective means for each separate case to follow justice steadfastly, otherwise it is to be determined by a conscious mixture of all.